<u>Due: May 25, 2001</u>
Request for Proposal

IDE AP Course Application: A Technology Innovation Challenge Grant
June 1, 2001 to May 31, 2002

GOAL: Provide support for high school student access to AP courses both synchronously and asynchronously supported through a variety of technologies with the objective of increasing the number of students taking AP courses and exams in the STATE OF IOWA.

<u>**Purpose and Intent**</u>

Objective #1: To pilot various AP courses utilizing a variety of distribution methods with an emphasis on on-line applications.

Objective #2: To provide students in diverse settings access to AP on-line courses.

Objective #3: To increase the number of students taking AP on-line courses in the STATE OF IOWA.

Objective #4: To increase the number of AP exams taken by students in the STATE Of IOWA.

Objective #5: To provide for the recruitment of teachers and school districts across the STATE OF IOWA to participate in the AP course offerings.

Objective #6: To provide training for teachers.

Objective #7: To increase the availability of options in AP offerings to all Iowa students.

Objective #8: To document the impact of, and provide direction of AP on-line courses through project management and evaluation activities by the Iowa Department of Education.

<u>**Background**</u>

In January 2001, the U. S. Department of Education notified the Iowa Department of Education that fiscal year 2001 appropriations legislation for the Technology Innovation Challenge Grant (TICG) program set aside funds to be awarded to the Iowa Department of Education. The Iowa Department of Education was awarded $1,586,000 million for on-line advance placement courses for development and delivery.

According to the Iowa Department of Education's 2000 <u>Annual Condition of Education Report</u>, in 1999 Iowa enrolled 74,953 high school junior and senior students in public school and approximately 4670 high school junior and senior students in nonpublic schools. The number of students participating in the AP program was 3,659. During the decade of the 1990s the average rate of increase for number of candidates participating in the AP program was approximately 11.5%. The range of the increase over the decade was from a low of 4.7% in 1998 to a high of 19.5% in 1993.

In 1999 the number of AP examinations taken per thousand 11th and 12th graders in the United States was 165. The same year in Iowa it was 59 AP examinations taken per thousand students placing Iowa 46th with in the United States.

In addition, the percentage of Iowa schools participating in the AP program was 35.6%. This ranked Iowa 40th out of fifty states plus the District of Columbia. In 1999, the average participation of the United States was 56%.

The goal of this grant is to develop on-line programming for high school student access to AP on-line courses both synchronously and asynchronously supported through a variety of technologies. This project is to include but not limited to Web-based applications, with the objective of increasing the number of students taking AP on-line courses and exams in the State of Iowa.

Rosanne Malek (Project Director), John O'Connell (Technology consultant), and Mark Andrews (Webmaster) will manage the project. Rosanne will supervise and coordinate activities of staff hired to complete grant activities in conjunction with the selected RFP applicants as well as work with Mark to publish information on the Iowa Department of Education's Web site. She will also coordinate the development of the projects RFP, the contract(s) awarded to successful vendor(s)/institution(s), all activities arising from the project, and budget.

The following information was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education as part of the application for funds. This is included as background information for bidders.

Definitions

AEA - Area Education Agency

AEIOU Evaluation Model - provides guidance for data collection, analysis and reports. Accountability, Effectiveness, Impact, Organizational structure, Unanticipated outcomes

Asynchronous - not happening at precisely the same time

AP Exam - as developed by The College Board Advanced Placement Program, College Entrance Examination Board and Educational Testing Service

ICN - Iowa Communications Network is a statewide, two-way interactive, full-motion fiber optic distance learning network.

Iowa Licensure - holds a valid Iowa Teaching License with the proper endorsement for the specific content area.

LEA - Lead Education Agency

Online - any utilization of electronic medium, to at least include but not be limited to, Web-based applications for the conveyance of information.

Project director - supervises and coordinates activities of staff hired to complete grand activities in conjunction with the selected RFP applicant(s)

Supplant- to take the place of, substitute for

Supplement- makes an addition to

Project Expectations

The expectation of this project is to provide all 11th and 12th grade students in all areas of Iowa equal access to participation in the AP program both synchronously and asynchronously through a variety of technologies. Activities within this project will guarantee that if a student wants to participate in the AP program they will be able to do so using more than just one mode of learning to include, but not be limited to, Web-based applications. Also, the successful RFP applicant(s) will work with the Iowa Department of Education and local districts to make sure that students will receive both an acceptable grade on the AP examination as well as credit toward their high school graduation.

A. Provide increased opportunities for high school students and educators to utilize technology to increase the number of students taking AP on-line courses. (Objective #3)

      1) During the 2001-2002 grant year, the vendor(s)/institution(s) will provide increased access and opportunities to Iowa educators and students. Participation will be open to students and teachers in both public and accredited nonpublic high schools. The major initiative will be to increase the AP on-line course offerings under this grant activity utilizing a variety of technologies to include, but not be limited to, Web-based applications. The vendor(s)/institution(s) will provide an integrated approach to the AP on-line course offerings so as to permit students access both synchronously and asynchronously. While Iowa has experience with distance education through courses offered via the ICN, an interesting point about the class offerings is that while extensive, it reveals limited offerings in the AP area via this medium.

      2) During the 2001-2002 grant year, the project will increase the number of students participating in the AP on-line program. The expectation would be for an increase of 20% or higher for the number of students participating in the program. This would result in over 730 more students taking the test. As a result of the project there should be an increase in the average AP score which in 1999 was 3.16 for the 5,241 exams taken by Iowa students. In addition, the project aims to improve the percentage of Iowa females who score three or above to the same level as the Iowa males who take the test.

B. To increase the number of AP exams taken by students in the State of Iowa. (Objective #4)

      During the 2001-2002 grant year, the vendor(s)/institution(s) will increase the number of examinations taken in the AP program. Iowa Department of Education's 2000 <u>Annual Condition of Education Report</u> lists the number of examinations taken in the AP program was 5,241. During the decade the average rate of increase for number of examinations taken in the AP program was approximately 13%. The range of the increase was from a low of 4.9% in 1998 to a high of 21.8% in 1993. This places Iowa as 46th in the United States.

      The expectation is an increase of 25% or higher for the number of examinations taken as part of the program. This would result in an increase of over 1300 examinations taken by students participating in the program, or an increase of 20 or higher for the number of examinations taken per thousand of students.

C. To provide for the recruitment of teachers and school districts to participate in the AP course offerings. (Objective #5)

      During the 2001-2002 grant year, the project will increase the number of schools participating in the AP program.   According to the Iowa Department of Education's 2000 <u>Annual Condition of Education Report</u>, the percentage of Iowa schools participating in the AP program was 35.6% in 1999. This ranked Iowa 40th out of fifty states plus the District of Columbia. In 1999, the average participation of the United States was 56%.

<u>Constraints</u>

Project implementation efforts must meet the following criteria.
    1. Geographical representation.
      A. It will be demonstrated that efforts are being made to increase student participation and completion of AP on-line courses in each of the six (6) geographical areas of the state identified as North-west, North-central, North-east, South-west, South-central and South-east. (Objective #2, #7)

      B. It will be demonstrated that efforts are being made to include area education agencies, local school districts and institutions for higher education. These agencies

will become elements of a statewide systemic network to be developed for the dissemination of teacher training efforts. The emphasis of the training will be on working with the AP on-line program as outlined by the successful vendor(s)/institution(s) applicant. (Objectives #5, #6)

2. Special considerations

A. Inclusion of children living below poverty level. The envisioned project will allow districts that are impacted by stagnating economic conditions to provide access to high school junior and seniors who would not normally participate in the AP on-line program. This project will support the inclusion of all Iowa children by providing the availability of options in AP on-line offerings to all 11th and 12th grade students in both synchronously and asynchronously manner using a variety of technologies including, but not limited to, Web-based applications. (Objective #2, #7)

B. Inclusion of Nonpublic Schools. Juniors and seniors high school students and educators at all accredited nonpublic high schools will benefit from activities of IDE AP on-line course application: A Technology Innovation Challenge Grant. They are able to participate and have access to the information and resources available from the project. Accredited nonpublic educators are eligible to participate in training for teachers. The project will provide increased opportunities for accredited nonpublic high school students and educators to utilize technology to increase their number of students taking AP on-line courses. (Objective #2, #3, #6, #7)

C. Special efforts will be made to attract the participation of small school districts where economic factors preclude the hiring of faculty to offer AP on-line instructors. (Objective #2, #3, #6, #7)

Project Coordination and Evaluation

A project management staff will provide coordination and facilitation for all grant activities. Project management staff will be Rosanne Malek (Project Director), John O'Connell (Technology Consultant), and Mark Andrews (Webmaster). Rosanne will supervise and coordinate activities of staff hired to complete grant activities in conjunction with the selected RFP applicants as well as work with Mark to publish information on the Iowa Department of Education's Web site.

The Project Coordination staff will provide coordination between all education levels and the vendor(s)/institution(s) in the integration of new technology and telecommunications into the AP on-line course offerings. The technology consultant will provide leadership regarding integrating technology and telecommunications into the AP course offerings in Iowa schools and oversee this activity.

The Project Director will select an evaluation team that will assist each of the partners in designing evaluation plans and components. Dr. Gary Phye, Iowa State University, College of Education, Ames, Iowa will direct evaluation activities of the evaluation team. The scope and sequence for evaluation of activities and oversight will parallel the U.S. Department of Education OERI document, "An Educator's Guide to Evaluating the Use of Technology in Schools and Classrooms."

As activities to accomplish the project goals are implemented, the evaluation team will provide assistance, as needed, in developing individual evaluation plans and procedures for each component. The evaluation team serves as an evaluation resource for the various project components. It is also the responsibility of the evaluation team to compile evaluation data collected by each component, and report findings to project management and interested stakeholder groups. The evaluation team will, in essence, serve as cluster evaluators for the

impact evaluation of the project and will ensure that common elements are included in the evaluation plans so that conclusions can be drawn across project components.

The evaluation team will collect, analyze and report data to support all aspects of the evaluation plan. Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be used for data collection. The basis for the evaluation plan will be the AEIOU model. See Appendix A- AEIOU model of evaluation and the U.S. Department of Education OERI document, "An Educator's Guide to Evaluating The Use of Technology in Schools and Classrooms." The evaluation will also include a fiscal evaluation of the project's cost effectiveness. A year-end evaluation report will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education within 90 days of the conclusion of the project. Where appropriate, data regarding national indicators will be collected and reported. Eastern Iowa Community College District will continue to conduct a survey regarding ICN semester-long classes. In addition, the evaluation team will continue to collect and analyze data for three years, which is two years beyond the project life to determine the full impact that the project has had on enhancing student learning. The Iowa Department of Education and the project director will retain final approval of the evaluation report.

Project Coordination and Evaluation Timelines
Successful vendor(s)/institution(s) will participate in a one-day project orientation session. This session will occur in July and have as its focus the establishment of program coordination and evaluation data collection timelines. Also, the successful applicant(s) will have to provide a mid-project formative evaluation report due on January 1, 2002. The structure and nature of this report would be developed during the July meeting. An end of project report is due to Dr. Gary Phye by June 30, 2002. Format to be developed during the July meeting.

Information for Bidders
The bidder agrees to finish all work associated with this proposal and submit final reports no later than July 1, 2002.

Awards
It is the intent of the Iowa Department of Education to announce the award(s) on or around June 1, 2001 or when the U.S. Department of Education releases the award. All monies must be spent by June 1, 2002.

Number and Amounts
At least one vendor/institution but no more that four vendors/institutions will be awarded up to $1, 586,000. The Iowa Department of Education reserves the right to determine and negotiate awards.

How to Submit an Application
The deadline for submission of application is **4:30 p.m. on May 25, 2001.** One original application and three (3) copies, for a total of four(4), must be submitted by the deadline. Applications must be mailed or hand-delivered to be received by or on **May 25**, 2001, to the office of Rosanne L. Malek, Third Floor, Grimes State Office Building, East 14th Street and Grand Avenue, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146. No fax or electronically transmitted applications will be accepted.

How Applications are Selected for Funding
Beginning May 25, 2001 a panel will review applications and make selections. Scoring will be based upon the scoring criteria found elsewhere in this application. A scoring rubric and designated weighting and points are included elsewhere in this application. See Appendix E.

<u>Notification of Awards</u>
All applicants will be notified on or around June 1, regarding the status of their application being funded. Contact will be made with the contact person listed on the application cover page.

I. Terms and Conditions
The proposal must be responsive to the RFP requirements and organizational support, experiences, price and format of submission and compliance with the number of pages. The following criteria, not necessarily listed in order of importance, will be used to evaluate the proposal and the bidder's ability to carry out the following:

The successful bidder:
1. will consult and coordinate with the State of Iowa Information Technology Department, Hoover Building B Level, Des Moines, IA to utilize the 21st Century Learning Infrastructure for information storage and delivery of the online AP courses.
2. provide face-to-face student/teacher communication per course on a minimum of two week intervals via ICN technology.
3. will assure that the educators certifying completion of AP on-line courses hold a valid Iowa teaching license.
4. will utilize the AEIOU Evaluation Model as appropriate in developing project evaluations. See Appendix A
5. will utilize the 24 measures of quality as outlines in "Quality on the Line". See Appendix C

The plan of implementation should supplement the current offerings in a school district. It is not the intention of this project to supplant what is currently in use by local school districts.

Bidder's compliance with price proposal requirements and reasonableness of rates.
The Department of Education reserves the right to evaluate the financial capability of any or all bidders to satisfactorily complete the requirements for this RFP.

Rejection of Proposals
The Department of Education reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received as a result of this announcement.

Appeal of RFP awards
Any applicant may appeal the denial of a properly submitted program application to the director of the Iowa Department of Education within ten (10) days of the notification of denial.

The appeal must be based on the grounds that the process was conducted outside of statutory authority, violated state or federal law, policy, or rule, did not provide adequate public notice, was altered without adequate public notice or involved conflict of interest by staff or committee members. {281 IAC 7.(5)}

II. Scope of Work

Scope of Activity
The vendor will:
A. Provide resources to high schools to increase high school student access to AP courses both synchronously and asynchronously supported through a variety of technologies to include, but not be limited to, Web-based applications.

B. Provide information to Iowa educators and students about availability of AP on-line courses throughout the state.

C. Disseminate information about current exemplary AP on-line courses and preservice teacher education.

D. Provide increased opportunities for high school students and educators to utilize technology to increase the number of students taking AP on-line courses.

E. Increase the number of AP exams taken by students in the STATE OF IOWA.

F. Provide for the recruitment of teachers and school districts to participate in the AP on-line course offerings.

G. Assure that the educators certifying completion of AP on-line courses hold a valid Iowa teaching license.

H. Provide training for teachers.

I. Increase the availability of options in AP course offerings to Iowa students.

Deliverable Summary and Schedule
See Appendix D for timeline matrix
June 2001
> a) Establish specific goals for each of the activities
> b) Determine type of technology make-up for the first semester courses including, but not limited to, Web-based applications.
> c) Active recruitment of school districts

June, July and August 200
> Development of evaluation plan and procedures for project objectives.

July 2001
> Development of criteria for AP course offerings and listing of potential course offerings

Early August 2001
> Posting of AP course offerings

October and November 2001
> Posting of second semester course offerings

May 2002
> All activities complete

III. Proposal Preparation Instructions

A. Technical Proposal
The bidder will explain how they plan to approach each objective and the steps that will be taken to complete each. Bidders must show that they understand the complexity of providing on-line courses and on-going support to the LEAs in order to make a convincing proposal. If the bidder does not need to address an individual task, as it does not fit into their proposal, then they should explain why that specific task is not part of the proposal.

B. Cost Proposal
The bidders should show detail cost by objective. These costs should reflect all associated cost with the specific objective. (salary of staff, travel, lodging, resources), etc.

C. Qualifications and Experience
The bidder should explain its organization and experience, both in general and in on-line AP course projects. The bidder should list personnel to be assigned to the project and their level of organizational responsibility. The bidder will also supply an annotated resume of staff assigned to the AP on-line course project. The complete resume(s) of all staff involved in the project should be located in Appendix A, the bidder is asked to supply project staff names, titles, location as well as an

organizational chart showing the level of organizational responsibility of the key staff members involved in the project.

In Appendix B, the bidder should document experience in performing similar AP on-line course projects. The bidder should supply in Appendix C, a statement from its financial institution that it has the financial capacity to carry out this project or file a performance bond equal to 100% of the bid.

**Online AP Course RFP
Cover Page**

Please Type   **Due: May 25, 2001**

Company/Institution Name_____

Address _____City, State, Zip_____

Company/Institution CEO/President_____

Fax Number_____email_____

Contact Person (who can answer questions about this grant):

Name_____Phone Number_____

Supervisor signature to authorize Contact Person_____

Title_____Phone_____email_____

Address_____City, State, Zip_____

To be eligible, the RFP must be RECEIVED at the Iowa Department of Education on or before May 25, 2001 by 4:30 p.m.

FAX NOT ACCEPTED

Hard copies delivered or mailed to:
    Rosanne Malek
    Third Floor
    Grimes State Office Building
    East 14th Street & Grand Avenue
    Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

This cover sheet **MUST** be completed and used for the cover for the RFP.
Submit one(1) signed original plus three complete copies of the RFP.

Proposal Narrative

The narrative portion of the proposal should be prepared simply and economically and be **no more than twenty (20) pages in length, double-spaced and in a font no smaller than twelve (12) point font. Margins must be equal to at least 3/4 inch.** Each specific mandatory area listed below must be addressed using the heading for that area. Each of the mandatory areas and only the mandatory areas are to be covered in the twenty page maximum. Excluded pages are the cover page and the mandatory appendix. All application pages must be securely stapled. Please **do not** use special bindings and binders. Relevant support documents, only those specified in the RFP, will be attached to the application and must be kept to a minimum. Supplementary materials such as commercial publications and videotapes will not be reviewed.

Proposal Format

INSTRUCTIONS: Applicants are requested to develop a Narrative Proposal following the format provided below. The proposal must address tasks as outlined earlier. The proposal must include each of the areas listed below and is to be limited to not more that twenty (20) pages as described in the above. The Applicant will also provide in separate appendices- specific references as requested on under section III- sub-section C - Qualifications and Experience.

Final proposal order shall consist of the following mandated areas:
1. Signed cover page (mandatory)

2. Philosophy of vendor on AP Online Courses (mandatory)

3. Technical Proposal (mandatory)

4. Cost Proposal of Tasks (mandatory)

5. Deliverable Summary and Schedule of Tasks (mandatory)

Appendix A Qualifications and Experience of Company/Institution and staff. (mandatory)

Appendix B Document experience in performing similar On-line courses. (mandatory)

Appendix C Statement from financial institution that company/institution has the financial capacity to carry out this project or supply a performance bond with the bid. (mandatory)

APPENDIX A

Overall Project Evaluation Model

The AEIOU evaluation model (see Appendix B for complete explanation of the AEIOU matrix) will guide the structure of the project's evaluation efforts. Through the use of categories, this model provides guidance for data collection, analysis, and reports. The categories included in the model are:

- **A**   Accountability
- **E**   Effectiveness
- **I**   Impact
- **O**   Organizational structure
- **U**   Unanticipated outcomes

Based on a review of project goals and activities, the evaluation team will develop general questions related to the first three categories of the model: accountability, effectiveness, and impact. These are presented below. For indicators specific to each goal, see the attached evaluation matrix.

Accountability

Accountability attempts to provide evidence to indicate the completion or accomplishment of project goals and activities.

- Were RFPs distributed? To whom?
- Were exemplary integration of technology applications solicited?
- How many educational opportunities were offered?
- How many students participated in the in the educational opportunities?
- What was the average score of the participants?
- Did the percentage of females who received a passing score increase?
- What types of opportunities were provided?
- Who participated in the educational opportunities?

Effectiveness

Effectiveness issues attempt to look past the mere completion of a goal and begin to qualify the success of the project. Description of projects and participants, requests for materials and educational opportunities, and response of participants are indicators of effectiveness.

- What educational sectors were represented?
- What was the range of participating students?
- How did participants respond to the content and delivery method of the training?
- How many on-line courses were accessed?
- How many sites participated in the educational opportunities?
- How many participants?

Impact

Impact attempts to look at the true success of the project. In particular, what has changed in teaching and learning as a result of the successful implementation of this project?

- Have other schools expressed an interest in participating in the project?
- Have educational opportunities increased as a result of increased access?
- How have classroom activities changed?
- Have requests for education opportunities provided by the project increased?
- Are requests for additional courses increasing?

Appendix B

Assessment/Evaluation Framework
1998-99

Introduction:

Evaluation should be an integral part of every project/partnership. It is important to remember that the role of evaluation is not simply to point out what was wrong or unsuccessful. Evaluation is a useful tool for project management to assist in the decision making process. It provides not only an understanding of what is working or not working but also insight into why things are successful or not. It can help identify things that should be changed in continuing projects as well as point out strengths that could contribute to the success of future projects. Evaluation provides project participants as well as outsiders a stronger understanding of project goals, objectives, activities and results.

There are many models of evaluation as well as many methods of collecting data for evaluation. All are equally appropriate and dependent on specific project goals and objectives. It is desirable that all funded projects follow a similar evaluation structure. For the IDE Advanced Placement Technology Innovation Challenge Grant recipients, the structure is the AEIOU approach. What follows is a brief explanation of the AEIOU evaluation approach, some suggestions for developing an AEIOU worksheet and a sample framework for progress reports.

AEIOU Evaluation Approach

The AEIOU approach does not dictate what model of evaluation or methods of data collection are used. It simply provides a structure and guidance for the collection of data and the reporting of results. The AEIOU approach has five components: (a) accountability; (e) effectiveness; (I) impact; (o) organizational context; and (u) unanticipated outcomes. The first three, accountability, effectiveness and impact, should be included in all evaluation reports. Organizational context and unanticipated outcomes should be included when. Each of these is explained in more detail below.

Accountability: *Is the project accomplishing its proposed goals and objectives?*

> Accountability simply attempts to determine if the goals and objectives of the project proposal have been accomplished. For example, questions related to accountability might include (but not be limited to):

> ☐ Have you assessed the needs of the students, staff and/or others?

> ☐ Were baseline data collected?

> ☐ Have you established priorities?

> ☐ Have you identified quality indicators of student success (achievement and/or performance)?

> ☐ What activities related to improving student success have been implemented?

> Answers to these questions should be included in all updates and evaluation reports. Quality indicators might include frequency counts, behavior and attitude shifts; number and demographic information of participants; and a listing and/or summary of activities undertaken.

> Accountability information frequently comes from a review of project records, or a survey may be used to collect information from participants.

Effectiveness: *To what extent were the proposed goals and objectives achieved?*

Effectiveness focuses more on formative evaluation. It looks past the mere fact that an activity was completed and attempts to determine how well the activity was done. The focus is on attitudes and knowledge. Continuing with the student success example, questions might include:

- ☐ What differences compared to baseline data did you note?

- ☐ What quality indicators of continuous improvement have you collected?

- ☐ What changes were evident in the continuous improvement of all students, staff and/or others?

- ☐ What attitudinal and/or behavioral changes were noted?

- ☐ What evidence of collaborative problem solving and planning has been gathered?

- ☐ Were some needs not affected?

- ☐ What unexpected events, activities, changes in procedures or other surprises were noted?

Again, answers to these questions would go into project evaluation updates and reports. Quality indicators could be reflected in participants' responses. The source of the information is the participant and the collection method would vary but could be either survey or focus group.

Impact: *What difference did the project make?*

Impact focuses more on summative evaluation. Quality indicators dealing with changes that have occurred because of project activities are included. For example, impact might apply to changes in behavior of an individual, a group or a system. Obviously, what type of change should occur is dependent on the goals, objectives, and activities of your project. Again, questions might include, but not be limited to:

- ☐ What are some attitudes that have changed because of the project?

- ☐ What changes in policies and/or procedures have occurred?

- ☐ How have the expectations for student success, the goals and objectives, the priorities and the quality indicators been modified based on evidence of continuous improvement?

- ☐ What sustained changes in student achievement have been noted?

- ☐ What long-term changes in student achievement have become evident?

- ☐ What implications for modification (short-term and long-term) have been noted?

- ☐ What evidence of collaborative problem solving and planning has been gathered?

Indicators for these questions might be individual responses and the sources may be participants including staff, students and others. Methods of data collection will vary but could include follow-up surveys, focus groups, and observations.

Organizational Context: *What structures, policies, or events helped or hindered the project in accomplishing its goals?*

This component focuses on events beyond the control of project managers that either helped or hindered the achievement of project goals and objectives. Questions included in this component

include but need not be limited to:

☐ What might you do differently to overcome these hindrances?

☐ What changes are anticipated in the future to ensure accomplishment of the proposed goals and objectives?

☐ What changes will be incorporated that will help all students to succeed?

Collection methods usually include interviews of key personnel or focus groups including the individuals most impacted by the project.

Unanticipated Outcomes: *What happened that you did not plan or expect?*

Sometimes, things happen or change as a result of the project that were not planned or anticipated. Under impact the planned changes based on project goals and objectives were evaluated. This component looks at those unplanned changes, either positive or negative, that occurred. A primary question to be answered here is:

☐ **How will these factors be incorporated in future planning?**

The most useful methods of collecting data for this component are informal communications and observations.

Using the AEIOU worksheet

You might want to create a worksheet as a guide. It is not required, but if completed during the early stages of the project, it can become a valuable resource for the collection and reporting of evaluation data. Lines are filled in under each of the first three components (accountability, effectiveness, and impact) identifying specific questions, indicators, data sources and collection methods to be used for the evaluation of the project. Organizational context and unanticipated outcomes are typically not included on the worksheet because they deal with the unexpected.

Specific questions should relate to the goals, objectives and activities of the projects. Indicators are the *what* or those pieces of information that provide the answer to the questions. The data source is the *who* or the individual(s) that will provide the information, such as project manager or participant. And the collection method identifies *how* the information will be collected, such as looking at records, surveys, focus groups and/or observations. Including a time line for the collection of data would be helpful.

Framework for Required Reports

Introduction:

Briefly describe the project, including background information that is important to an understanding of the project. Also, include a description of project goals, objectives, activities, and key personnel.

AEIOU Structure:

Each component should be a separate section. For each component, describe how the data was collected and provide information to support answers to component questions specific to the project.

Conclusions:

Identify goals and objectives that have successfully been achieved. Describe the strengths of the

project, as well as the weaknesses (if there were any). Include any recommendations that would be helpful

for others doing similar projects. Also include changes to make as the project continues.

Appendix C

NEA AND BLACKBOARD INC. STUDY FINDS 24 MEASURES OF QUALITY IN INTERNET-BASED DISTANCE LEARNING
"Quality On The Line" study released at Blackboard Summit

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 21, 2000 – The National Education Association (NEA) and Blackboard Inc. today unveiled an important, research-driven list of quality benchmarks for distance learning in higher education. The list of 24 quality measures is the centerpiece of "Quality On the Line" -- an Institute for Higher Education Policy study commissioned by NEA and Blackboard Inc.

With the growth worldwide of teaching and learning on the Internet, attention is being paid to the nature and quality of online higher education. Speaking before an international forum of higher education policymakers convened for the Blackboard Summit 2000, NEA President Bob Chase and Blackboard Inc. Chairman Matthew Pittinsky previewed the findings of the study and declared the 24 benchmarks essential to ensuring excellence in Internet-based learning.

"The distance from faculty to student must be measured in results achieved for our students," said Chase. "The benchmarks identified in this study are important guideposts as our nation navigates the future of online higher education."

Pittinsky said, "The quality of the education we provide for students is the driving force behind the way teaching and learning takes place. The benchmarks identified in the NEA-Blackboard study will be invaluable to colleges and universities around the world for years to come as they keep their focus on quality while working to create and improve their Internet-based teaching and learning environments."

To formulate the benchmarks, the report identified first-hand, practical strategies being used by U.S. colleges considered to be leaders in online distance education. The benchmarks distilled from this study are divided into seven categories of quality measures currently in use on campuses around the nation. Many are common sense, but the study validates their importance. The categories and benchmarks include:

Institutional Support Benchmarks

1. A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures to ensure both quality standards and the integrity and validity of information.
2. The reliability of the technology delivery system is as failsafe as possible.
3. A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the distance education infrastructure.

Course Development Benchmarks

4. Guidelines regarding minimum standards are used for course development, design, and delivery, while learning outcomes -not the availability of existing technology - determine the technology being used to deliver course content.
5. Instructional materials are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet program standards.
6. Courses are designed to require students to engage themselves in analysis, synthesis, and evaluation as part of their course and program requirements.

Teaching/Learning Benchmarks

7. Student interaction with faculty and other students is an essential characteristic and is facilitated through a variety of ways, including voice-mail and/or e-mail.
8. Feedback to student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.
9. Students are instructed in the proper methods of effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources.

Course Structure Benchmarks

10. Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn at a distance and if they have access to the minimal technology required by the course design.
11. Students are provided with supplemental course information that outlines course objectives, concepts, and ideas, and learning outcomes for each course are summarized in a clearly written, straightforward statement.
12. Students have access to sufficient library resources that may include a "virtual library"

accessible through the World Wide Web.

13. Faculty and students agree upon expectations regarding times for student assignment completion and faculty response.

Student Support Benchmarks

14. Students receive information about programs, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services.

15. Students are provided with hands-on training and information to aid them in securing material through electronic databases, inter-library loans, government archives, news services, and other sources.

16. Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to technical assistance, including detailed instructions regarding the electronic media used, practice sessions prior to the beginning of the course, and convenient access to technical support staff.

17. Questions directed to student service personnel are answered accurately and quickly, with a structured system in place to address student complaints.

Faculty Support Benchmarks

18. Technical assistance in course development is available to faculty, who are encouraged to use it.

19. Faculty members are assisted in the transition from classroom teaching to online instruction and are assessed during the process.

20. Instructor training and assistance, including peer mentoring, continues through the progression of the online course.

21. Faculty members are provided with written resources to deal with issues arising from student use of electronically-accessed data.

Evaluation and Assessment Benchmarks

22. The program's educational effectiveness and teaching/learning process is assessed through an evaluation process that uses several methods and applies specific standards.

23. Data on enrollment, costs, and successful/innovative uses of technology are used to evaluate program effectiveness.

24. Intended learning outcomes are reviewed regularly to ensure clarity, utility, and appropriateness.

About the NEA

The National Education Association (NEA) is the nation's largest professional association of higher education faculty. NEA is also the nation's largest employee organization, representing nearly 2.5 million elementary and secondary teachers, higher education faculty, education support personnel, school administrators, retired educators, and students preparing to become teachers. For more information visit http://www.nea.org/.

About Blackboard Inc.

Blackboard is a leading online education company. Its software products and Web services reach 3,000 colleges, universities, K-12 schools and other organizations in every state and in more than 70 countries. More than 2.1 million people worldwide teach and learn in online education environments powered by Blackboard. Blackboard education partners include Academic Systems Corp., Archipelago, HorizonLive.com, Houghton Mifflin, KPMG LLP, Learnware, Microsoft, NextEd, Norton Publishing, Oracle, Pearson Inc., PeopleSoft, Sun Microsystems, Sylvan Learning Systems and The TLT Group. Additional information about Blackboard can be found at http://www.blackboard.com/

About The Institute for Higher Education Policy

The Institute for Higher Education Policy is a non-profit, non-partisan organization whose mission is to foster access to and quality in postsecondary education. The Institute's activities are designed to promote innovative solutions for the important and complex issues facing higher education. Recent reports include: What's the Difference: A Review of Contemporary Research on the Effectiveness of Distance Learning in Higher Education; The Tuition Puzzle: Putting the Pieces Together; and Assuring Quality in Distance Learning. Additional Information about the Institute can be found at http://www.ihep.com/

Appendix D
TIMELINE

June 2001 – May 2002

Activities	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M
1.1	/	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
1.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
2.1	*	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
2.2	*	/	*	*	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	X
3.1	*	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
3.2	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
4.1	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
5.1	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
6.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
7.1	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
8.1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
8.2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
8.3	/	/	/	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X
8.4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	X

/ = Significant Action

* = On-Going Activity

X = Activity Complete

Significant Action

1.1 June: Release RFP. July: Award contracts.

2.1 August: Posting of AP course offerings; November: posting of second semester course offerings.

3.1 July: development of criteria for AP program offering and listing of potential courses.

3.2, 4.1, 5.1 June: establish specific goals for each of the activities.

5.1 June: Active recruitment of school districts.

7.1 June: type of technology make-up for the first semester course decided.

8.3 June, July and August: Development of individual evaluation plans and procedures for each component.